	If you have any additional comments about the culture of scientific integrity related to the foll... - Q79#1 - scientific products - Please insert comments in the text boxes below
1	Scientific products could use independent oversight.
2	Difficult to express due to fear of retaliation. Products have also been (b) (5) .
3	Are required to have peer review
4	As with open expression of scientific opinions, scientific products have also faced (b) (5) .
5	N/A
6	No basis to judge
7	actions in the political arena lapped over into all scientific areas in the last 2 years
8	Nothing altered to my knowledge
9	(b) (5) .
10	none
11	Noticeable improvements in this area is happening with the change in leadership.
12	There are to many scientists desiring to make the science policy decisions.
13	Lack of QA
14	Somewhat delayed. There were too many bureaucratic layers imposed.
15	(b) (5)
16	(b) (6) He lacks a basic understanding of the fundamentals of (b) (6) Consequently, he is unable to determine what exactly needs to be done for a science review he assigns and how much work and how long would it take to complete the science review.
17	(b) (5)
18	The staff do not generally understand or respect that EPA risk assessments are consensus regulatory documents where no one person's view is expressed in an unfiltered manner.
19	EPA products were not based on science in the prior administration.
20	Everything at EPA should be double blind and come from two sources...to many people pushing agendas that cant be proven...climate?????
21	Our AA was generally clear about the expected outcome prior to the science being discussed.
22	(b) (5), (b) (6)
23	(b) (5)
24	See last response. Scientific products rely on other scientific products, and with each different division doing things differently, it causes confusion regarding what is and is not required.
25	(b) (5) that better fits first line customer needs.
26	na
27	I felt ashamed to be associated with EPA during the final two years of the Trump administration.
28	none
29	Previous administration did not support scientific integrity.
30	Science was not in the forefront
31	Highly politicized and aimed to further the goals of any given administration.
32	Agree
33	If you exclude regulations and litigation, I commend the ability for most (not all) scientific products developed over the past couple years to maintain scientific integrity.
34	there still seem to be (b) (5)
35	hopefully EPA will remain committed to science-based decision making
36	I have no specific experience in this area.
37	(b) (5)
38	(b) (7)(A) I do not do basic research or write articles for publication in peer reviewed journals.
39	EPA staff should be allowed to speak publicly on scientific (not policy) topics related to their expertise.
40	Review requirements and "controversy" changes over time. Different administrations have approached their discomfort differently. I think the most scientific integrity is demonstrated by trusting the process of open, transparent, peer review and discussion of scientific facts, methods, analysis, and implications
41	Used in (b) (6) Often suppressed or disregarded by senior political appointees in the previous administration.
42	Took away focus on anything that did not agree with the prior administration.
43	(b) (5), (b) (6)
44	We had so many products delayed by program and regional review.
45	Not applicable
46	EPA culture supports scientific products *only if* they have the support of senior political leadership.
47	N/A
48	My position does not include scientific products
49	With (b) (5) being viewed politically, scientific work in this field is constantly being hindered. Until this can be removed from the equation all scientific results are constantly facing challenges, delays, cancellations, etc... This does not yield "open expression(s)" unfortunately. [Copied and pasted in other answers]
50	(b) (5)
51	Same as question above
52	It's hard to answer this since the different levels of management act differently
53	We already have clearance and journal peer review, but now we have (b) (5) .
54	Have ability to access scientific journals and other resources and appreciate ability to read journal articles without paying for access.
55	(b) (5) which undermines the credibility of the Agency and the field with the public.
56	n/a
57	NA

58 (b) (7)(A)

59 science did not have a strong role in informing policy decisions

60 Not certain

61 I believe that the agency doesn't always focus on the highest priority, most impactful issues, (b) (5) I would like to see more transparency around what contaminants issues are the biggest threat.

62 If the administration didn't like it, there were no scientific products

63 I wasn't allowed to express my honest opinion about the stressors (b) (5), (b) (6)

64 (b) (5)

65 N/A

66 sometimes delayed, suppressed, or put a political spin on it. Especially (b) (5) findings

67 (b) (5)

68 (b) (5)

69 agree

70 Same as above.

71 Work on (b) (5) was suppressed and unfunded. This was a betrayal of the American public. Also, (b) (5) .

72 N/A

73 (b) (5)

74 (b) (5)

75 Career civil servant management do not stand up to political interference. They also do not seem to care or understand what scientific integrity is.

76 I have not worked directly on science activities.

77 (b) (5) .

78 Good science has been and should always be practiced within a technical governmental agency. The Agency should not be subject to Political Appointees who will say or imply otherwise.

79 (b) (5) Luckily, in present day we are taking the time to more accurately adjust the proposal, which may require a supplemental proposal.

80 (b) (5)

81 N/A

82 Political appointees at EPA (b) (6) hindered scientific products.

83 Too often, staff scientists and technical staff act as gate keepers and (b) (5)

84 Some products are more emphasized (b) (5)

85 N/A

86 Publication of journal papers did not appear to be hindered in any way. (b) (5)

87 In the time period specified, these seemed affected deleteriously for the Agency at large. Not a Region-specific issue.

88 (b) (5)

89 (b) (5)

90 (b) (5)

91 Review and control of scientific products was controlled in areas of the (b) (6)

92 (b) (5)

93 (b) (5)

94 Frustration that many of the scientific products are for only large communities. Too expensive for the small communities.

95 Products generally ok, but (b) (5)

96 Although I had limited contributions to several reports, their conclusions were mostly ignored by the previous administration.

97 none

98 I have seen no difference in scientific products that I am associated

99 (b) (5)

100 (b) (6) . (b) (5) The process is extremely slow and cumbersome, and changes frequently. Most approvers already have too much work to do and this is a minor part of their job, so it gets deprioritized. (b) (5) . It often took >1 month to get items approved, even if it was just a 10 slide PowerPoint.

101 (b) (5), (b) (6)

102 (b) (5)

103 Products are produced on a standard flow-path and schedule that has been in place for 20 years. No inhibition during the 19-20 frame, rather, the program was highlighted, leading to more demand for optimization services.

104 Administrative burden for publishing a scientific product has grown exponentially in the past decade. New tracking systems are developed without removal of old ones; the new one replicates existing efforts while adding a minor change. Our review of products before submission typically takes longer than the journal peer-review process.

105 in 2019 and 2020 unless the product was connected to a specific priority of the (b) (6) (b) (5)

106 None

107 (b) (5)

108 (b) (5)

109 No

110 Politicization of science in the prior administration harmed EPA's reputation.
111 No basis to judge.
112 Again, ditto above. [redacted] has all the data and we are just trying to use EPA's policies for all State and EPA's benefit.
113 Relevant and timely.
114 NA
115 management disagreeing with introductory slides and citations therein of peer-reviewed articles in journals respected in the scientific field
116 From a scientific integrity perspective, EPA should invest more money and staff time in evaluating past work and policies to see where we were right, and where we may have been not so right, so we can learn and improve.
117 Although I started my position in Jan 2020, I came into the position with some anecdotal stories of the [redacted] science. Upon taking my position, I asked my supervisors about this and was told that [redacted] This never affected my research or publications, but I did find it to be contrary to ideas of scientific integrity.
118 Internal reviews can sometimes be time-consuming especially when involving multiple offices/regions.
119 N/A
120 [redacted]
121 No Comments
122 lack of timely decisions affecting external commitments; deliberate stalling by political leadership
123 [redacted]
124 On last section, you did not offer a "not applicable" option. I did not attempt to publish anything to a scientific journal.
125 there are way too many "software systems" being created to hold scientific proposals, procedures and documentation, it has become a nightmare to produce an acceptable volume of relevant research,
126 pretty clear that anything that did not support the Trump Administration's political agenda would be suppressed or altered
127 [redacted]
128 My team has a very high level of scientific integrity for our scientific products.
129 Some scientific products were not investigated.
130 feel more confident about the integrity of our products now than during last few years
131 I don't work in the scientific community. I deal with property.
132 Our DRA strongly supports our applied research and publication in the peer reviewed literature
133 Depending on the policy choice desired, [redacted].
134 [redacted]
135 none
136 [redacted]
137 Scientific products have always been allowed to be presented without constraint.
138 In [redacted], we have no world class, visionary scientists remaining in top scientific leadership positions. Our best were [redacted] These positions have now all been filled by less credentialed scientists who are focused on building and implementing admin processes disconnected from goals of delivering high quality and timely scientific products.
139 [redacted]
140 Managers have a hard time with science they don't understand and don't seem to want to ask. "I don't agree" or "change this" are not helpful comments when reviewing a scientific product and the comments are not based on disagreement with the observation or the conclusion drawn. Decisions based on fear of litigation can repress scientific understanding.
141 There was no way we could perform SI without fear or favor.
142 [redacted] senior management only cares how quickly reports are finalized.
143 NA
144 [redacted]
145 My products have not been held up for unreasonable length of time or altered prior to presentation or publication.
146 [redacted]
147 [redacted]
148 [redacted]
149 DOES NOTAPPLY TO MY SUPPORT OF SCIENTISTS
150 [redacted]
151 Our group invested significant resources into developing messaging that will help the general public understand the results. Nearly all of this was removed from the final product.
152 The review process was often delayed for years or more at the [redacted] level. Everything required review before release, but then the review never happened.
153 [redacted]
154 [redacted] Paper finally was published, but should not have been held hostage by program office that long
155 None
156 I am not a scientist and I will not produce any products.
157 Work to regain trust of rank and file employees and the public
158 [redacted]
159 [redacted]
160 Guidance or other information needed on release of assessments that apply previously published approaches (updated with new data but same approach). Should not have really long clearance processes through program office
161 I do not do science

162 (b) (5), (b) (6)

163 In recent years there has been intrusion and micro-management by political appointees, and to a lesser extent by other management levels, in the content of science documents, and communication about the science.

164 (b) (6) has a disdain for science. That permeated the agency through the political appointees. The news showed many instance of how political appointees meddled with science based decision and products.

165 Some of our scientific products have improved over the past two years. These are the products created by science divisions ((b) (6) that I have seen. Some of our regulatory documents have been cobbled together to meet deadlines; these required rework after signature.

166 removed from our website for (b) (5) Had been there since 2010.

167 Our Laboratory was able to purchase quality scientific products that contributed to the value and excellence of our work.

168 (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(A)

169 This is not about my own work, but my colleague's manuscript became delayed due to the manuscript potentially creating an optics issue for another group of scientists (b) (6)

170 (b) (5)

171 I heard of multiple scientific products or decisions that were held up by political appointees because they were inconvenient for their political agenda.

172 (b) (5), (b) (6)

173 As one of the (b) (6) , you all already know the story. The assessment was completely torpedoed in the dark by a political appointee (b) (6) and elements of (b) (6) ((b) (6)

174 (b) (5)

175 changing administrations can affect need for, support for, and discussion of scientific products

176 Inadequate time at EPA to make an assessment.

177 While not directly experiencing this I have heard of example of products being impacted in a way that did reflect integrity over the last few years. At Agency level, not (b) (6)

178 (b) (6), (b) (5)

179 (b) (5), (b) (6)

180 Staff would be wise to parrot the direction of management

181 No new project have been completed in CY 2021, so too early to tell.

182 political interference was actual or implied

183 (b) (5)

184 EPA internal review procedures for publications are cumbersome and often substantially slow down the publication of research due to burdensome bureaucratic hurdles and managers who do not review products in a timely manner

185 Responses to inquiries that upper management did not support were not forwarded.

186 (b) (5)

187 (b) (5)

188 Staff people contribute to written products and leadership concurs/approves the products. I have no immediate knowledge of changes to scientific products in (b) (6) I do understand that the science advisory

189 some managers don't understand science sometimes or are not really interested in science

190 Scientific products are published however many of the internal staff finds out about the publications from external stakeholders.

191 Did not apply to my work in (b) (6).

192 My only publication in the last two years was a (b) (6) and did not release any previously unreleased information and was therefore not subject to scrutiny by the AA.

193 (b) (5)

194 we need to move to electronic format for all deliverables, data, etc. With respect to data we need to have the ability to load these items (especially analytical data) and be able generate tables, etc to review/validate/authenticate/perform quality control.

195 our regulations are ignoring science

196 N/A

197 (b) (5)

198 My experience with the (b) (6) is that there are several managers that err on the site of caution to the detriment of scientific integrity. (b) (5)

199 (b) (5) It doesn't matter if those products could help improve public health and support state efforts to better prioritize resources to focus on protecting the public. Mgmt likes their top-down narrative because it's easy.

200 excessive interference by leadership

201 lack of a review process

202 no comment

203 scientists need more training

204 Scientific information that should have been published was (b) (5)

205 (b) (5)

206 (b) (6) Laboratory's analytical products are produced with scientific integrity.

207 political appointees interfered with scientific judgement

208 N/A

209 it takes too much time for products to be released. There needs to be more timely review from all levels of management, especially upper management.

210 Not applicable.

211 i was a new hire

212 (b) (5) .

213 none

214 Admin Change
215 Rigid scientific bases are used for decisions
216 (b) (5)
217 n/a
218 (b) (5)
219 Personally, if I disagree with the report, I provide the reasons why and a different path forward. Usually well received.
220 (b) (5)
221 Same as above.
222 No usually a part of my job.
223 (b) (5)
224 No comment.
225 I am new to the EJ field, but it seems that the way science is being described excludes the community experience.
226 Political appointees reviewed high visibility products and provided input that had to be considered or the product run the risk of not being cleared.
227 No comments
228 Discussion of scientific opinion were always encouraged but this did not always result in that opinion being expressed in the scientific products unless strong opposition from the primary reviewer was maintained.
229 previous administration at HQ was not supportive.
230 n/a
231 new rules need to be vetted completely through the agency to all staft that may have opinions, past experience, or stakeholders that may have such information as well
232 NA
233 Headquarters and (b) (6) need to support GS13 and GS14 level technical positions in the Regions, e.g., statisticians, GIS analysts, human health risk assessors. Regional experts have and are far likelier to develop close working relationships with (b) (6) and, hence, better meet their needs than periodic help from HQ or (b) (6).
234 Suppression of adverse opinions can occur if there are expected negative consequences to an industry, even if the state is supportive.
235 I believe our scientific products were produced with integrity, but may have been ignored the farther up the decision making chain.
236 Scientific findings under the prior administration were subject to editing for political considerations.
237 None
238 The restrictions listed above applied to research products as well.
239 Depends on management if there is allowance to participate/attend travel and/or meetings.
240 Increasing demands or hurdles that must be met that don't increase the quality or impact of the work.
241 (b) (5)
242 We need training on importance and use of significant figures!
243 (b) (5)
244 Several articles in the news recently about EPA work being muddied by political interference, for example Dicamba and other pesticides. Also political interference on toxicology reviews of chemicals in the news.
245 (b) (6) staff cause problems/significant delays with scientific products - oftentimes with no reason given.
246 Have to support the agency objectives. (b) (5)
247 These are frequently delayed more than seems necessary, whether controversial or not. In my experience publication clearance and quality assurance approval has been faster for (b) (6) authors than (b) (6) authors on collaborative papers. I've never seen any evidence that the longer clearance process for (b) (6) has resulted in greater scientific integrity.
248 (b) (5)
249 (b) (5)
250 Historically, we would interact with the upper level managers. However, this time we never briefed them, we did not interact with them, or share our research. They never saw our opinions. They never saw us.
251 (b) (5)
252 Different education backgrounds have different level of understanding and care.
253 There has been a culture of deputy division directors, division directors and office directors not willing to stand up to the AA immediate office, and not willing to protect the opinions and decision-making of their staff.
254 N/A
255 See above
256 (b) (5)
257 politics got involved in science with negative results.
258 None
259 The format for high quality scientific products seems to often be in conflict with the need for products that are understandable by the general public. The Agency should explore ways to meet both of these needs without compromising either.
260 I am a new employee and cannot speak to the culture of scientific integrity prior to November 2020.
261 (b) (5)
262 as long as requested
263 I have experienced a culture of steering away from particular "hot button" topics within EPA and (b) (6) in particular due to the higher level of scrutiny, which translates into longer delays to delivery of scientific product. This affects the scope of scientific products that I feel are ok to produce.
264 (b) (5). This was over the last 2 years. No issues since January 20.
265 I am not free to express some matters of personal opinion in my scientific products, even with a disclaimer that this is only my opinion. (b) (5)
266 The last acting Administrator dismissed the report; (b) (6) said nothing; Center administration said nothing.
267 I trust (b) (6) decision makers to do as much as they can to preserve our scientific integrity.
268 I will not comment for fear of reprisal.
269 (b) (5)
270 More transparency with regard to how scientific products were created would be beneficial for integrity
271 n/a
272 NA
273 NA
274 Need more encouragement for publications
275 The reports I work on have been (b) (5)

276 Since so much of the science I do relies on data collected/curated by others at the agency, the process of informing everyone of my findings is important to integrity, but significantly slows the process of writing and publication of final products
277 NA
278 critical
279 WE need to be open to express where our research may have not met our original hypothesis and why.
280 N/A
281 (b) (5)
282 The products appear to be more robust under a new administration that supports science.
283 I think that science is respected at EPA. Particularly scientific products, which themselves are the result of the scientific method and is based on evidence. Part of this respect, I think, is skepticism. I have often experience skepticism about methods, findings and implications. In other words, skepticism about how the science was conducted, what the evidence suggests, and what the implications for policy are or should be. I think this culture of skepticism is, on the whole, the healthy form of skepticism.
284 (b) (5)
285 I didn't trust officials brought in by the Trump administration.
286 N/A; This does not appear to be directly applicable to my work duties
287 (b) (6) & program office collaborations can be hindered due to inadequate plannning to account for (b) (6) onerous review process
288 The political appointees during the Trump administration.
289 The previous Administration had clear ideas of what we were supposed to be working on and what we were not supposed to be working on. Previous work that we had been working on that went against their political agenda but that was a valid scientific inquiry had to be dropped
290 (b) (5)
291 (b) (5)
292 N/A
293 There is always room for improvement in the development, review and release of our scientific products. It is complicated by the fact that much of the information is CBI and there are no data requirements. .
294 No comment
295 (b) (5)
296 (b) (5), (b) (6)
297 Most, if not all of the time I felt like our team's scientific products were completely sound.
298 Making work related to climate change public was not always supported.
299 (b) (5), (b) (6)
300 There were definitely a handful of decisions from (b) (6) that were questionable/rushed (b) (5) etc.). These were all during the prior administration.
301 (b) (6) scientific analysis are generally well done and of sound science (b) (5), (b) (7)(A)
302 Any scientific products were heavily reviewed before being sent to HQ.
303 Report reviews delayed leading up to the recent election (were not priority for review during campaign season, and thus reporting out activities were delayed by months).
304 No basis to judge
305 N/A
306 (b) (5)
307 During the last administration it was very difficult to move any major products along. Products I worked on were effectively stalled for years due to fear of them being seen as controversial and not approved.
308 (b) (5)
309 (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(A)
310 Not applicable
311 (b) (5)
312 (b) (5)
313 The current suspicion/review of documents generated in the previous administration may delay the release of legitimate work.
314 N/A
315 It's hard to say that leadership wouldn't let you publish something for which you self-censored and decided not to complete work on it.
316 There is a significant backlog of (b) (6) scientific products stemming from work 2016-2021
317 Scientific Products needs to be reviewed by peers who are technically competent in their field of expertise not necessarily by Grade or GS level
318 N/A
319 Same as above
320 Abstracts for scientific conferences at any level of authorship were reviewed at the AA level. Presentations and guest lectures were also reviewed at the AA level. This level of review (b) (5)
321 (b) (5)
322 Some topics (i.e. (b) (5) were essentially discouraged from investigation, or changed to avoid drawing attention. Other topics (e.g. risk from airborne COVID or its countermeasures) were dealt with a great deal of transparency and fortitude despite being at odds with the administration agenda.
323 (b) (5), (b) (7)(A), (b) (6)
324 N/A
325 Approved Products and procedures were not followed after primary lead was removed from project
326 (b) (5), (b) (6)
327 This questionnaire asks about the last two years (2019-2020). I have not witnessed problems with scientific integrity during this time period. My answers would have been very different at the political level if you had asked about 2017-2018.
328 a certain senior level manager in the (b) (6) does not understand the scientific products policy and guidance documents. (b) (5)
329 For providing comments on policy documents backed by scientific knowledge/data, (b) (5) .(b) (5) .

330
I was a team lead for a product that was almost final in draft form in fall 2018, ready to share with Programs for review, when the product was not allowed by the senior leadership in the (b) (6) and the Administrator to go into this next step. The scientific integrity policy failed because it relied on senior leadership to support its' implementation, which they did not.
331 (b) (6) has a rigorous review process that allows improvement in presentation, while also allowing for differences of opinions to be expressed
332 (b) (5)
333 Please see preceding comment.
334 N/A, but I imagine this was hindered by the administration at the time.
335 (b) (6), (b) (5)
336
Whether it was overt or not, it was evident that the previous administration valued 'other factors' (such as economic considerations) as balancing over and against scientific conclusions.
337
(b) (5)
338 I am new hire, without the work history at EPA to meaningfully comment.
339 (b) (5), (b) (7)(A), (b) (6)
340 Analysis would be preformed to get the desired answers
341 You need a "Not Applicable" answer - I do not have any scientific opinions, as I am an Architect!
342 No basis to respond- hired 8/2020
343 Release of information is NEVER smooth or timely, it takes a very very long time if it happens at all.
344 To even present a poster at a scientific conference, an abstract must be reviewed by the IO. In the past, (b) (6) have denied or delayed responses past the deadline. This is just for posters, publications by scientific staff within (b) (6) are a much more enormous hurtle. Scientific communication wat conferences is key to conducting good science and being transparent about our methods. Managers should make it easier, not harder to communicate science outside of EPA.
345 Political appointees made decisions that ignored science and were based on politics. Science was sidelined and ignored for many decisions. (b) (5)
346 the decisions that I help write and the work products that I directly influence are of high scientific integrity.
347 (b) (5), (b) (6)
348 (b) (6) submission process was messy and opaque over the last few years. It still needs work but we have seen recent progress.
349 Joined the agency late 2020 so cannot answer previous questions
350 My position does not involve science
351 In my opinion, there is too much reliance on laboratory analyses as the final word. Direct-sensing technology is advancing faster than laboratory techniques in many instances. Still, if a result conflicts with lab data, many simply assume the lab analysis must be correct and the new technology is flawed. These assumptions are often made by people who have little to no understanding of the laboratory methodology and its potential flaws for a given situation.
352
changes to scientific products were made in haste, sometimes as a reaction to upper management. Some staff would follow direction, others could ask for more detail/clarity in writing
353 n/a
354 It was clear that high-level appointees at headquarters could not be relied upon to act with integrity and would not take seriously the advice/findings of career scientists if it did not suit their own or the administration's political purposes.
355 I have had to soften my language on process assessment interpretations regarding (b) (5)
356 I am new to the agency this time around but when I worked at EPA from 2004 to 2013, I felt comfortable using science and felt supported in sharing and learning more science to make EPA's work robust and unbiased.
357 Most scientific products continued on a good path but there were a few exceptions that were notable.
358 EPA does not base decisions based on science. Again things are an order of magnitude worse in the new administration.
359 One of my concerns is the timeliness. (b) (6) . That process has been working relatively well, however, I see an increasing number of steps both from a review standpoint as well as the systems required to review a document - (b) (6) . That gradual accumulation of steps starts to delay articles.
360
While I did not experience pressure related to products, I have heard that there were pressures applied to colleagues' products including extended internal reviews and questioning of conclusions. However, the source of some of this has involved internal politics (b) (6) .
361 (b) (5)
362 New Employee
363 N/A
364
(b) (5)
365 (b) (5)
366 The questions asked had to do with publication of findings - you didn't ask if pursuit of a publication or product was discouraged. It takes years of work to publish - some roads were not taken because of politics.
367 should be allowed to contribute
368 Encourage new scientists at EPA to submit publications to peer reviewed journals. Allow time for scientists at the GS-12 and above to do so.
369 (b) (5)
370 I felt that (b) (5)
371 None
372 N/A
373 nothing
374 Quality of products is very high when front line staff have the ability to review and approve.
375 NA
376 my job doesn't have anything to do with scientific opinions, etc.
377
(b) (5)
378 na
379 Scientific products are only as good as the skills of the staff are. (b) (5)
380 n/a
381 (b) (5)

382 (b) (5) I think if this were to have been discovered in the prior administration, (b) (5), that it could bring all of our work into question. And knowing it's been tolerated across (b) (6), how far does this awareness/tolerance go with our staff, branch chiefs and senior management? How wide-spread is the cover-up? Taking these sorts of shortcuts to getting publications for scientists seems to be creating a culture in (b) (5) that is more about our CVs than about producing EPA reports that are beneficial and FREE to the public and standing behind a U.S. Government seal. Why are our reports a 2nd priority in this organization to publishing journal articles, posters, presentations and datasets?
383 It's hard to express scientific opinions to an Administration that didn't seem to believe in science.
384 (b) (5)
385 (b) (6) scientists did their best under the working conditions that they were dealt with
386 There needs to be clearer separation between purely science documents and policy documents, and especially when a document crosses over and includes both. Maybe include a clear purpose statement or disclaimer.
387 (b) (5)
388 How we handled some aspects of COVID-19 response (b) (5) were not executed well at times. The blanket adoption of CDC guidelines (which are often industry specific or geared only towards health departments) was impossible at times to follow due to operational conflicts with existing regulatory requirements.
389 (b) (5)
390 None
391 (b) (5)
392 Need more refined authorship policy. We operate in the same old abused, misused, unclear practices of the past.
393 (b) (5)
394 Not truer, disagree.
395 NA
396 (b) (5)
397 I have discovered in this day and time it is insufficient to know what specific toxic chemicals are in some material. Rather we need to know what species or compound is. Surely there are instruments that can determine if Pb is elemental or combined with other elements/compounds that may affect its toxicity and dissemination into the environment.
398 Politics must not corrupt science!
399 We do not work with environmental datasets. Our data analysis is focused on internal metrics and process improvement.
400 (b) (5) within EPA (b) (6) management over the past 4 years. No rationale was provided.
401 No Comment
402 (b) (5), (b) (6)
403 Improvement of the quality of scientific products depends on using state-of-the-art scientific advances which should be more easily integrated into our workflows. There is too much resistance to the application of new technologies. If the limitation is that they need to be peer-reviewed or officially implemented into the Program Offices, then EPA should create an office dedicated to accelerating the approval of state-of-the-art scientific approaches/technologies.
404 n/a
405 In the 6 months I've been at EPA, I've been pleasantly surprised by all the technical webinars and trainings I was able to access. Management seems for support these trainings.
406 na
407 N/A I was not conducting scientific research or projects which developed scientific products/opinions
408 During the previous administration, it was clear that we were not free to trust that scientific products would be carried up with integrity since almost all reasonable scientific truths were contrary to official administration policies
409 (b) (5)
410 Made assumptions everyone followed integrity/ethical behavior.
411 not as rigorous or transparent
412 Managers always favoring industry
413 Upper management rushes products to meet political commitments. The integrity of the data is of secondary concern.
414 see above
415 N/A
416 No obstacles have been encountered
417 NA
418 I entered somewhat agree to the last couple of questions, because I don't specifically work on scientific products
419 (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(A)
420 n/a
421 no comment
422 The (b) (5) decision process was an example of violations of scientific integrity.
423 (b) (5)
424 I was not involved in producing any scientific products.
425 Some managers take a long time to approve papers in STICS
426 It seems that some career scientists believe that their view is superior to other career scientists in other offices, regardless of the work product and statutory requirements.
427 no real basis to judge in the past 2 years
428 Please note that in some of prior questions (about scientific publications for peer review) would have liked there to be a N/A answer because I personally have not had scientific papers for publication. Other scientific products are typically recommendations based on scientific data analysis or application of expertise. The line between scientific product v. recommendation based on scientific evaluation/analysis or review is an important distinction. Far too often policy decision makers/managers make decisions that may be contrary to the staff recommendation considering other factors (including politics, industry perspectives/pressures, etc.). The issue is a need for a transparent decision making process so that the administrative record is clear who made what decisions when, so that the technical staff recommendations can remain "in-tact" and with integrity in the record.
429 No additional comments
430 We are severely limited from going to scientific meetings and presenting our work. (b) (5) The review process on briefings and scientific manuscripts is onerous and flawed, even before 2016!
431 (b) (5)
432 I was not informed or major Agency actions until I heard it reported by the news.
433 some projects made a priority over others because support of senior management
434 (b) (5), (b) (7)(A), (b) (6)

435 With the Trump Administration, other managers within (b) (6) (b) (5) [redacted]

436 The review of scientific products was not standardized across scientific peers in Branches and Divisions. The requirements could be quite different for similar products/procedures/decisions for different individuals. There were different standards for the development and evaluation of the same types of scientific products and research efforts especially in the review processes. (b) (5) [redacted]

437 I'm not a scientist, so I don't really have these, but I know that some of my colleagues who are scientists (b) (5) [redacted], particularly during the last administration.

438 n/a

439 Discouraged from publishing journal articles

440 Sound and unbiased

441 (b) (5) [redacted]

442 It's hard to say the Agency has scientific integrity after the atrocities of the Trump administration. (b) (5) [redacted]

443 often delayed in layers of review

444 (b) (5) [redacted] Nothing of significance was accomplished from 2016-2020. Response to comments -- (b) (5), (b) (6) [redacted]

445 I don't have the basis to comment.

446 Delay in approving materials

447 the review process of scientific products for critical documents is slow.

448 (b) (5) [redacted]

449 same as above

450 Being allowed to research and assemble information to make points was free flowing.

451 I did not witness direct manipulation of data, such as changing one number to another. However, (b) (5) [redacted]

452 Were we not doing some of the work that was needed because EPA administrators did not want certain things worked on.

453 (b) (5) [redacted]

454 (b) (5) [redacted]

455 During 2019-2020, EPA was restricted from producing the highest quality scientific products because of political policy decisions at the highest levels.

456 The previous administration did not share or consult regions on issues with national implications.

457 Extremely satisfied

458 (b) (5) [redacted]

459 I am concerned that the integrity of products may have been compromised because resources where resticted

460 N/A

461 NA

462 On my previous answer, while they are not directly applicable to my duties, my interaction with my colleagues are the basis of my response.

463 What scientific products?

464 Science? What's that? (Said HQ)

465 These were generally fine, but possibly sometimes swayed by the theory that global warming is not a concern.

466 Managers protect people from political interference, but there is no protection from the managers themselves when they don't like the results or methods. There is no real solution here since EPA's scientific integrity policy is almost entirely focused on political interference, rather than direct line management interference which is much more nuanced because they have to ensure quality and yet those efforts to ensure quality often end up not ensuring quality so much as suppressing innovation. And we aren't college professors. The truly dedicated can devote their own time to getting it published and paying the open-access fee, but they can't solicit others to pay the open-access fee. The EPA policy needs to more forthrightly explore the boundary between a manager ensuring quality and suppressing research. It's easy to see it when a Republican suppresses a study under the guise of quality-control; but harder to see it when a manager does the same thing.

467 Some national products did not appear to follow science.

468 Scientific production was certainly emphasized, but the technical review and clearance process was terribly convoluted and slow. Necessary clearance documents were often irrelevant to the product.

469 (b) (5) [redacted]

470 (b) (5), (b) (6) [redacted]

471 Product development proceeded at a slightly slower pace, but significant delays at more senior levels of the Agency have lead to scientific integrity questions, including interference leading to the alteration of scientific conclusions.

472 Administration alteration of the conclusions contained in them or outright suppression of the products themselves was awful

473 suppressed by trump policies

474 There is always a tendency among management to make edits to make something sound better than it is. Some managers will correct when you point out, some don't.

475 (b) (5) [redacted]

476 None

477 No additional comment.

478 We need more information and updates about the products.

479 (b) (5) [redacted]

480 The quality of scientific products has diminished as the scientific knowledge of the manager diminish
481 This did not seem to be of value to the Trump administration.
482 none
483
my management does not seem to value my scientific work products but I do them anyway since they are part of my job description and they should be used for decision-making
484 N/A
485 None.
486
Several individuals, including some colleagues, expressed concerns about openly presenting scientific findings given potential responses from stakeholders (government, industry, etc.). The results themselves were not suppressed, but (b) (5) . While I agree it's important to consider the implications of presenting findings, I felt strongly, in this case, that the immediacy and clarity of those findings were diminished as a result.
487 At (b) (6) that is part of (b) (6) , this was not an issue.
488
The item referenced "(m)y scientific findings, products or conclusions" and is not applicable to me, as I do not provide scientific findings, products or conclusions, rather I review them.
489 None
490 Same comment as next topic. (b) (5)
491 Now that Trump is gone we can (b) (5)
492 N/A
493 (b) (5)
494 Staff were (b) (5)
495 (b) (5)
496 n/a
497 (b) (5), (b) (6)
498 EPA's ponderous bureaucracy nickels and dimes the scientists' time and concentration so they get less scientific work done.
499 If the 'scientific product' doesn't create an issue with already formed opinions and agendas, then you're fine.
500 (b) (5), (b) (6)
501 some products were released and others were held, some for as many as 4 years.
502 Senior leadership in (b) (6) (b) (5)
503 No additional Comment
504
(b) (5)
505 are not compared and vetted enough with citizen, non, profit, state and local and international groups and agencies to avoid redundancy and improve quality.
506 I work in (b) (6) Not related to this.
507 (b) (5)
508
509 EPA needs to hire more experts. It is better than contracting out scientific and engineering work.
510 (b) (5), (b) (6)
511 Agree
512 I am not sure there is always transparency in how scientific products are created. Hence, there may be a trend to moderately disagree (due to lack of knowledge) about the scientific development process. On occasion, scientific products are impacted due to budget limitations and nothing else. I
513
(b) (5)